

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13, 15-16, 18-19, 21-23, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gillis et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,323,447) in view of Kostic et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,549,784). Dependent claims 7, 12, 14, 17, 20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gillis et al. in view of Kostic et al. and further in view of Souissi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,327,300).

Applicant discussed the present Office Action in a telephonic interview with Examiner on December 14, 2004. An interview summary is attached. In response, applicant has amended claims 1, 8-9, 13, 16, 19, and 23 for clarification.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-26. If the Examiner finds any issue that is unresolved, please call applicant's attorney by dialing the telephone number printed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert N. Rountree
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 39,347

Robert N. Rountree, LLC
70360 Highway 69
Cotopaxi, CO 81223
Phone/Fax: (719) 783-0990

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 14 2004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of: **Schmidl**

Attorney Docket No.: **TI-30651**

Serial No.: **09/634,473**

Examiner: **E. M. Chang**

Filed: **August 8, 2000**

Art Unit: **2637**

For: **DYNAMIC EXTENSION OF FREQUENCY HOPPING
PATTERNS IN WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS**

INTERVIEW SUMMARY UNDER 37 CFR 1.133(b)

December 14, 2004

Honorable Commissioner of
Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

I hereby certify that the above correspondence is being facsimile
transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on December 14, 2004.

Robert N. Rountree

Robert N. Rountree, Reg. No. 39,347

A telephonic interview was conducted between Examiner Edith M. Chang and Robert N. Rountree, Attorney for Applicant, on December 14, 2004.

- (A) Examiner's Office Action of October 18, 2004 was discussed.
- (B) Claim 1 was discussed.
- (C) U.S. Pat. No. 5,323,447 to Gillis et al. was prior art.
- (D) Applicant's response of July 30, 2004 and the specification were discussed.
- (E) Applicant explained that Gillis et al. did not disclose all the elements of claim 1. Gillis et al. did not disclose a frequency hopping pattern with first and second frequencies as required by claim

TI-30651, Page 1

1. Gillis et al. did not disclose a "first frequency is specified by the frequency hopping pattern for a communication . . . that most closely precedes the selected communication" as required by claim 1.

(F) Examiner requested that claim 1 be amended to recite a "predetermined frequency hopping pattern" and "precedes in time" for clarification. Applicant agreed to amend claim 1 and to amend claims that are objected to.

(G) Examiner agreed to allow the case pending approval of her Primary Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert N. Rountree
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 39,347

Robert N. Rountree, LLC
70360 Highway 69
Cotopaxi, CO 81223
Phone/Fax: (719) 783-0990